

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/627,232	07/25/2003	George Van Campen	1027.P005USC1	2443	
29053 75	590 02/24/2006		EXAMINER		
DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 2200 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201-2784			FAULCON JR.	FAULCON JR, LENWOOD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3762		

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		71.				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/627,232	CAMPEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.	3762				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 L	<u>December 2005</u> .	•				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,13-18 and 24-31</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	·					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	·				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 13-18 and 24-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: it appears there is not proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter which deals with a repetition parameter that defines a number of pulses within a stimulation cycle "independent from one or several pulse frequency parameters."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 4-5, 13, 16-18, 24, 26-28 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (U.S. 2001/0007950) in view of as applied in the previous Office Action of July 27, 2005, and further in view of Reiss (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,317).

Reiss teaches of an interferential stimulator that comprises a repetition parameter associated with a stimulation setting that is independent of the pulse frequency parameter of stimulation setting (col. 1 lines 62-68 and col. 2 lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system as taught by North et al. to include a repetition parameter setting as taught by Reiss to provide improved treatment, as taught by Reiss. North et al., and Reiss teach of stimulation systems for treating pain and thus teach of analogous arts. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system as taught by North et al. to have the limitations of claims 1, 4-5, 13, 16-18, 24, 26-28 and 30-31.

Page 3

4. Claims 2-3, 14-15, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (U.S. 2001/0007950) in view of Lunch (U.S. Patent No. 5,038,781) as applied in the previous Office Action of July 27, 2005, and further in view of Reiss (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,317) as applied above.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of North et al. and Lunch for the reasons stated in the previous Office Action of July 27, 2005, and it would have been obvious to further combine the teachings of Reiss for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of North et al., Lunch and Reiss to have the limitations of claims 2-3, 14-15, 25 and 29.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kastrubin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,121,593), Stanton (U.S. Patent No. 4,392,496), Lynch (U.S. Patent No. 4,934,368), Mullet (U.S. Patent No. 5,031,618), Campos (U.S. Patent No. 5,097,833), Collins (U.S. Patent No. 5,251,621), Schaldach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,354,320), Madsen et al. (U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 3762

5,776,173), Michelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,955), Deno et al. (U.S. 2004/0049235), Skolnick (WO 87/07511).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenwood Faulcon, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-6090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9 to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela D. Sykes, can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,232

Art Unit: 3762

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.

George Manuel

Primary Examiner